

**REMARKS**

Claims 1–124 are pending in the present application.

Claims 120–124 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1,

Claims 1, 14–15, 48–49, 71, 73–74, 76, 97 and 103 were amended herein.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph (Definiteness)**

Claims 1, 14–15, 18, 26–29, 48–49, 58–61, 71, 76, 78, 87, 93 and 103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 was amended to correct the choice of terminology errors relating to recitation of “paradigm”, “ad hoc” and “empower” therein.

Claims 14–15 and 48–49 were amended to correct the choice of terminology error relating to recitation of “qualified” therein.

Claim 103 was amended to correct the grammatical error relating to recitation of “interests in the landlord”, replacing that phrase with “interests the landlord”. With respect to recitation of “interest” in claims 18 and 103, the claims are sufficiently definite. The standard for definiteness is whether a claim reasonably apprises those of skill in the art of its scope.

MPEP §§ 2173, 2173.02; *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Determining whether a claim is indefinite requires an analysis of whether one skilled in the art would understand the bounds of the claim when read in light of the specification. MPEP § 2173.02; *Credle v. Bond*, 25 F.3d 1566, 1576, 30 U.S.P.Q.2d 1911, 1919 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The claim is not indefinite if one skilled in the art would have no particular difficulty in determining whether a claimed feature has been implemented. *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The claim limitation is sufficient if the limitation enables those skilled in the art to draw a line between embodiments falling within the scope of the claim and those which do not. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 802-03, 218 U.S.P.Q. 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In construing the meaning of a claim limitation, it is entirely proper to look to the specification in order to interpret what the inventor intended by the claim term. MPEP § 2173.05(a); *In re Sneed*, 710 F.2d 1544, 1548, 218 U.S.P.Q. 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("It is axiomatic that, in proceedings before the PTO, claims in an application are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification, . . . , and that claim language should be read in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art."); *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 802-03, 218 U.S.P.Q. 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("It is well established that 'claims are not to be read in a vacuum, and limitations therein are to be read in light of the specification . . .'"); *In re Ehrreich*, 590 F.2d 902, 907, 200 U.S.P.Q. 504, 508 (CCPA 1979).

Claims 18 and 103 recite “indicating . . . an interest in meeting the requirements . . .”  
The clear meaning of this term, from the context and in light of the specification, is a desire or willingness on the part of a landlord to have associated real estate considered by the prospective tenant. Claim 103 further recites “the interesting entry”, which plainly refers to the earlier recitation of “an entry . . . that interests the landlord.”.

The strict antecedent basis error in claim 1 relating to recitation of “at least one tenant” has been corrected.

Claims 26–29 and 58-61 recite “a first real estate entry”, “a second real estate entry”, etc.  
“Entry” is, under various meanings ascribed to the term, both a noun and a verb. From the context and in light of the specification, the claims clearly employ the term as a noun, as in, for example, an entry within a database or a set of (electronic) records.

Claims 71, 76 and 78 have been amended to correct the grouping language error therein.

Antecedent basis for the recitation of “the real estate outfitting process” in claim 80 at line 5 is provided by recitation of “a real estate outfitting process” in claim 80 at line 4.

The recitation of “another phase” in claim 87 is clear from the specification, particularly Figure 12 and the associated description which disclose the phases of real estate acquisition and outfitting as including a real estate phase 1225, an analysis phase 1230, a due diligence phase 1235, a design phase 1240/1245, a bidding/estimation/value engineering phase 1250, a construction phase 1255, and a relocation phase 1260.

From the context and in light of the specification, the recitation in claim 93 of “bidding/estimation/value engineering” clearly relates to a phase involving an aggregation of the tasks (bidding, estimation and value engineering) rather than as alternatives.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 14–15, 18, 26–29, 48–49, 58–61, 71, 76, 78, 87, 93 and 103 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 (Anticipation)**

Claim 97 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,692,206 to *Shirley et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claim 97 recites that a file containing information relating to a potential real estate transaction--for instance, a project requirements specification (PRS)--may be uploaded to a shared-access storage medium by a first party (e.g., the prospective tenant), accessed and changed by a second party (e.g., a subcontractor in the exemplary embodiment), and uploaded in changed form for access by either the first party or a third party (e.g., the landlord, the

engineers, or the architects in the exemplary embodiment). Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited reference. *Shirley et al* discloses a contract generation application in which contract forms may be generated, changed, and accessed in changed form, but only teaches that the contract is generated by a single user. *Shirley et al* contains no teaching or suggestion of allowing multiple parties to access or change generated contracts or to use the contract generation utility to collaboratively generate a negotiated contract.

In addition, amended claim 97 recites that information relating to outfitting or provisioning real estate for a potential real estate transaction is uploaded by the first party (prospective tenant) in a manner accessible to a second party (the contractor or subcontractor) permitted to change the outfitting requirements (e.g., to satisfy local codes), with the changes accessible to the first party or a third party (e.g., the landlord) so that both acquisition of real estate and outfitting of such real estate (or at least the planning portions thereof) may proceed concurrently. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited reference.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 97 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 (Obviousness)**

Claims 1–7, 26–29 and 114–119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,404 to *Good et al* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,584,025 to *Keithley et al*. Claims 8–25 and 30–96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Good et al* in view of *Keithley et al* and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,356,878 to *Walker et al.* Claims 98–99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,692,206 to *Shirley et al* in view of *Keithley et al.* Claims 100–107 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Good et al* in view of *Walker et al.* Claims 108–113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,023,687 to *Weatherly et al* in view of *Walker et al.* These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. MPEP § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the applicant to produce evidence of nonobviousness. MPEP § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. MPEP § 2142.

Independent claim 1 recites a real estate demand database (i.e., a database of entries specifying desired real estate), as opposed to a real estate supply database (i.e., a database of entries specifying available real estate). Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Both *Good et al* and *Keithley et al* teach or relate to only real estate supply databases, not real estate demand databases.

In addition, as taught by the specification and explicitly recited in amended independent claim 1, an “ad hoc” real estate supply database is formed based upon responses of landlords to publication of at least one desired real estate characteristic (within a project requirements specification or “PRS”) by the prospective tenant:

An ad hoc real estate supply database may be formed of entries that are provided by landlords 205 in response to a particular PRS 505. Consequently, an ad hoc real estate supply database is formed responsive to the needs of an individual would-be tenant 115 and by landlords 205 that are interested in meeting those needs.

Specification, page 28, lines 2–7. Thus, the real estate supply database contains not simply all real estate available, but available real estate for which the associated landlord has affirmatively expressed an interest in leasing to the prospective tenant. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. *Good et al* simply employs a database of all available real estate:

The broker Web site for the present invention can become the sum total of all of the existing apartment information services by virtue of linking, and therefore provide the largest apartment database on the Internet.

*Good et al*, column 4, lines 26–30. Similarly, *Keithley et al* employs a comprehensive real estate supply database, the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), rather than a real estate supply database formed based on publication of a desired characteristic by the purchaser and affirmative response to that publication by one or more sellers.

Independent claim 2 recites a real estate demand database containing entries specifying desired real estate (as opposed to a real estate supply database containing entries specifying available real estate). Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. As noted above, both *Good et al* and *Keithley et al* teach or relate to only real estate supply databases, not real estate demand databases.



Dependent claims 8–23 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 2, and therefore incorporate the limitation of a real estate demand database. Independent claim 24 recites a real estate demand database; dependent claim 25, which depends from independent claim 24, therefor incorporates this limitation. Independent claim 36 also recites a demand database. In each independent claims 2, 24 and 36, entries within the real estate demand database specify desired characteristics of real estate sought by the prospective tenant.

As noted above, *Good et al* and *Keithley et al* do not teach or suggest demand databases. The additional reference (*Walker et al*) cited in the rejection of claims 8–25 and 36–57 discloses a conditional purchase offer (CPO) database 500 containing binding conditional purchase offers which change over time in a buyer-specified manner based on a specific variable or variables to allow the buyer to effectively submit multiple purchase offers:

As used herein, a variable CPO is a binding offer containing at least one variable condition submitted by a buyer for the purchase of an item, within a buyer-specified price range. As discussed below, the variable CPO may be guaranteed, for example, using a general-purpose financial account, such as a credit or debit account, maintained by a financial institution. Once a seller accepts the offer, the buyer is bound by the conditional purchase offer (CPO) buyer agency system 100 transferring payment from the general-purpose financial account previously designated by the buyer to the accepting seller (or transferring an indication of the general-purpose account itself to the seller for processing). Thus, even if the buyer ultimately fails to proceed with the transaction following acceptance of the CPO by a seller, the general-purpose account designated by the buyer will be charged the full value or a penalty.

A variable condition contains either a range of values or both an initial value and at least one alternate value therefor. A different buyer-defined price may be specified for each possible combination of conditions. The disclosed conditional purchase offer (CPO) buyer agency system 100 allows a buyer to

submit multiple purchase offers at one time. The multiple CPOs may be provided to sellers sequentially or simultaneously. In addition, when purchase offers are provided sequentially, the buyer may control the timing and priority in which the purchase offers are provided to the sellers.

*Walker et al*, column 5, lines 16–42. The CPO database thus effectively contains multiple offers each contingent upon satisfaction of a corresponding combination of conditions. The CPO thus does not reflect demand (i.e., interest in acquiring fungible property or services) based on specified desired characteristics, but instead merely (buyer-specified) guaranteed price-points based on variable conditions. Stated differently, the CPO database contains offers for any of the possible permutations of conditions, but with different price-points set for different permutations. The CPO database entries are therefore not based on the presence or absence of desired characteristics (not even on price, which is simply adjusted for different conditions) as in the present invention, but instead on the inter-relationship of characteristics.

Independent claim 26 recites a set of data records or entries each relating to real estate demand by two or more prospective tenants and based upon the real estate characteristics desired by those tenants, with at least one field (containing a desired real estate characteristic) indexed for searching. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. As noted above *Good et al* and *Keithley et al* relate only to supply databases, not tenant-oriented demand databases in which the different characteristics desired by corresponding prospective tenants are searchable.

Independent claim 30 recites an “ad hoc” supply database as discussed above in connection with claim 1, generated from combined responses by landlords to publication of a desired real estate attribute by a prospective tenant and including only entries corresponding to landlords affirmatively expressing interest in leasing to the prospective tenant. As noted above, such a feature is not shown or suggested by *Good et al* or *Keithley et al*, which relate only to comprehensive supply databases. Such a feature is also not shown or suggested by *Walker et al*, which does not teach or suggest any supply database, but instead teaches only CPO database 500, buyer (identity) database 600, and seller (identity) database 700.

Independent claim 58 recites a set of data records including multiple entries each corresponding to a piece of available real estate and produced in response to a requirements specification by a prospective tenant--that is, a supply database generated in response to and restricted based upon a prospective tenant's desired characteristic(s). Independent claim 62 similarly recites generating a supply database limited to real estate satisfying a prospective tenant's desired attributes. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. As noted above, *Good et al* and *Keithley et al* disclose only comprehensive supply databases, while *Walker et al* does not disclose a supply database at all.

Independent claim 67 recites accepting critique from a prospective tenant regarding a piece of real estate toured by that prospective tenant and sharing information derived from the critique with another prospective tenant. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited

references. Neither *Good et al*, *Keithley et al*, nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest allowing critiques or recommendations from one prospective buyer or seller to be shared with subsequent buyers or sellers.

Independent claim 71 recites enabling electronic access to a plurality of entities each associated with at least one real estate acquisition or outfitting phase, allowing online collaboration of parties involved in the acquisition and outfitting of real estate (i.e., the tenant, landlord, architect, engineer, contractor, etc.). Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al*, *Keithley et al*, nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest enabling electronic access to multiple parties involved in one or more of the various real estate acquisition and outfitting phases.

Independent claim 76 recites providing real estate acquisition and outfitting services at least partially in parallel and on-line. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al*, *Keithley et al*, nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest providing real estate acquisition and outfitting services at least partially in parallel and on-line.

Independent claim 78 recites providing real estate acquisition and outfitting services within a completion time reduced at least partially by use of an on-line mechanism. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al*, *Keithley et al*, nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest providing real estate acquisition and

outfitting services within a completion time reduced at least partially by use of an on-line mechanism.

Independent claim 80 recites determining when electronic information relating to a first real estate outfitting phase has been changed and, upon detecting such change, notifying an entity corresponding to a second real estate outfitting phase. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al*, *Keithley et al*, nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest determining when electronic information relating to a first real estate outfitting phase has been changed and, upon detecting such change, notifying an entity corresponding to a second real estate outfitting phase.

Independent claim 87 recites electronically sharing information relating to a potential real estate transaction so that a real estate phase of the potential transaction and another acquisition and outfitting phase (e.g., analysis phase 1230, due diligence phase 1235, design phase 1240/1245, bidding/estimation/value engineering phase 1250, construction phase 1255, and relocation phase 1260) is performed at least partially overlapping in time with the real estate phase. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al*, *Keithley et al*, nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest electronically sharing information relating to a potential real estate transaction so that a real estate phase of the potential transaction and another acquisition and outfitting phase is performed at least partially overlapping in time with the real estate phase.

Independent claim 100 recites selecting one or more pieces of real estate meeting a criterion of a prospective tenant, sending a request for information to each landlord associated with a selected piece of real estate, receiving responses to the requests from the landlords for review by the prospective tenant. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al* nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest selecting one or more pieces of real estate meeting a criterion of a prospective tenant, sending a request for information to each landlord associated with a selected piece of real estate, receiving responses to the requests from the landlords for review by the prospective tenant.

Independent claim 103 recites a real estate demand database reviewed by a landlord for entries of interest and a request by the landlord for entry into a corresponding transaction. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Neither *Good et al* nor *Walker et al*, taken alone or in combination, suggest a demand database and a mechanism for enabling a party interested in a particular entry to request entry into the transaction.

Independent claim 108 recites automatically handling renewal of a lease about to expire using a demand-driven on-line mechanism. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. *Weatherly et al* discloses an automated lease control routine for filtering evaluating potential tenants based on credit-worthiness. As discussed above, *Walker et al* discloses a mechanism for simultaneously submitting multiple purchase offers for each permutation of variable conditions with different price-points for different conditions. Neither

teaches or suggests automatically handling lease renewal for a lease about to expire using a demand-driven mechanism. Moreover, neither reference provides a reasonable expectation of success in combining the respective teachings.

Independent claim 114 recites combining information regarding a real estate deal from various sources and providing electronic access to such combined information to a plurality of parties, allowing on-line collaboration between the tenant, landlord, architect, engineer, contractor, etc. as described above. Such a feature is not shown or suggested by the cited references. As noted above, *Weatherly et al* discloses an automated lease control routine for filtering evaluating potential tenants based on credit-worthiness, while *Walker et al* discloses a mechanism for simultaneously submitting multiple purchase offers for each permutation of variable conditions with different price-points for different conditions. Neither teaches or suggests combining information regarding a real estate deal from various sources and providing electronic access to such combined information to a plurality of parties, and neither reference provides a reasonable expectation of success in combining the respective teachings.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1–96 and 98–119 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**AMENDMENTS WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

Claims 1, 14–15, 48–49, 71, 73–74, 76, 97 and 103 were amended herein as follows:

1 1. (amended) A system for instituting [a] tenant-centric [paradigm]marketing and provisioning  
2 in the real estate industry, comprising:

3 a network, said network adapted for enabling communication by at least one prospective  
4 tenant and a plurality of landlords;

5 a real estate facilitator, said real estate facilitator connected to said network and capable  
6 of communicating with the at least one prospective tenant and the plurality of landlords via said  
7 network, said real estate facilitator including at least one of a real estate demand database and  
8 [an ad hoc]a real estate supply database formed based upon responses of the landlords to  
9 publication of at least one desired characteristic of real estate by the at least one prospective  
10 tenant; and

11 wherein said network and said real estate facilitator [empower]enable the at least one  
12 prospective tenant to publish the at least one desired characteristic of real estate or to select a  
13 piece of real estate from [a collection of pieces of real estate in which the collection is formed  
14 responsive the at least one desired characteristic of real estate]the real estate supply database.



1 14. (amended) The method in accordance with claim 13, wherein said step of presenting the  
2 information specifying desired real estate to a plurality of landlords further comprises the step  
3 of:

4 posting the information specifying desired real estate for review by [all qualified]selected  
5 landlords of the plurality of landlords.

1 15. (amended) The method in accordance with claim 14, wherein a landlord comprises a  
2 [qualified]selected landlord allowed to review the information specifying desired real estate if  
3 the landlord meets a requirement for updating information that corresponds to the landlord, the  
4 information being included in a real estate supply database.

1 48. (amended) The method in accordance with claim 47, wherein said step of presenting the  
2 information specifying desired real estate to a plurality of landlords via at least one electronic  
3 transmission further comprises the step of:

4 posting to an internet-accessible web site the information specifying desired real estate  
5 for review by [all qualified]selected landlords of the plurality of landlords.

1 49. (amended) The method in accordance with claim 48, wherein a landlord comprises a  
2 [qualified]selected landlord allowd to review the information specifying desired real estate if  
3 the landlord meets a requirement for updating information that corresponds to the landlord via  
4 an electronic transmission, the information being included in a real estate supply database.

1 71. (amended) A method for facilitating real estate acquisition and outfitting, comprising the  
2 steps of:

3 providing information related to real estate in an electronically-accessible format;  
4 enabling electronic access to the information related to real estate to a plurality of  
5 entities, each entity of the plurality of entities corresponding to at least one phase of at least one  
6 of real estate acquisition and real estate outfitting; and

7 wherein the at least one phase of at least one of real estate acquisition and real estate  
8 outfitting is selected from [the group of phases comprising] a real estate phase, an analysis  
9 phase, a due diligence phase, a programming design phase, a development design phase, a  
10 bidding/estimation/value engineering phase, a construction phase, and a relocation phase.

1 73. (amended) The method in accordance with claim 71, further comprising the step of:  
2 simultaneously implementing at least two phases [of the group of phases] by  
3 electronically accessing the information related to real estate.

1 74. (amended) The method in accordance with claim 71, further comprising the step of:  
2 sharing a change to the information related to real estate caused by an entity  
3 corresponding to one phase [of the group of phases] with another entity corresponding to  
4 another phase [of the group of phases].

1 76. (amended) A method for providing real estate acquisition and outfitting services to a  
2 prospective tenant, comprising the steps of:  
3 providing real estate acquisition service;  
4 providing at least one real estate outfitting service selected from [the group comprising]  
5 analysis, due diligence, programming design, development design, and bidding/estimation/value  
6 engineering; and  
7 wherein said steps of providing real estate acquisition service and providing at least one  
8 real estate outfitting service are performed, at least in part, in parallel by using an on-line  
9 mechanism.

1 97. (amended) A method for facilitating real estate transactions, comprising the steps of:  
2 uploading, by a first party, a file, the file including information relating to outfitting real  
3 estate according to requirements of a potential real estate transaction;  
4 accessing, by a second party, the file;  
5 changing, by the second party, the file to reflect modifications to outfitting requirements;  
6 uploading, by the second party, the changed file; and  
7 wherein at least one of the first party and a third party may access the changed file to  
8 enable acquisition and outfitting of real estate for the potential real estate transaction to proceed  
9 concurrently.

1 103. (amended) A method for improving information access in areal estate deal, comprising  
2 the steps of:

3 providing a real estate demand database, the real estate demand database including a  
4 plurality of entries, each entry of the plurality of entries corresponding to a real estate deal;

5 reviewing, by a landlord, the plurality of entries;

6 detecting, by the landlord, an entry of the plurality of entries that interests [in] the  
7 landlord; and

8 requesting, by the landlord, to be admitted to the real estate deal corresponding to the  
9 interesting entry.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 47692-00003USPT  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/724,710  
PATENT


If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *dvenglarik@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 10-31-02

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel E. Venglarik  
Registration No. 39,409

P.O. Box 802432  
Dallas, Texas 75380  
(972) 628-3621 (direct dial)  
(972) 628-3600 (main number)  
(972) 628-3616 (fax)  
E-mail: *dvenglarik@davismunck.com*